

*H. C. P. M. L. S. C. S.*  
THE VENTILATOR.

---

THE VENTILATION

OF THE

**RADICAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,**

SHOWING THE

MOST INFAMOUS SYSTEM OF SWINDLING

THAT CAN BE FOUND

IN THIS OR ANY OTHER COUNTRY.

*W. J. Manker*

PUBLISHED BY THE DEMOCRATIC STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF OHIO.

---

COLUMBUS:  
OHIO STATESMAN PRINT.  
1868.

328.73

M31.5

pam

# THE VENTILATION OF THE RADICAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

I trust the reader will not regard me as intruding upon the patience that is too often taxed unnecessarily in personal explanations. It is due, however, to myself, that I should make some explanation in regard to my course. I have been a Republican from the organization of the party in 1854. Prior to that time, I was an abolitionist of the strictest order. In 1844, however, I voted for Mr. Clay for President. From 1846 until 1854, I acted with the Liberty party. I received an appointment in the Doorkeeper's Department of the House of Representatives, through the influence of my member of Congress, General Coburn, in the beginning of the Fortieth Congress. I continued in that position until the first of July, 1863, when I resigned my place. I endeavored to discharge my duty in the very humble position I held in the House, with as much propriety and civility as my nature, under such circumstances, would allow. I was one among many others who were wronged, as I believed, by an operation connected with the Doorkeeper's Department. I allude to the "substitute" matter, that is fully explained in the "Ventilator." In my efforts to investigate that subject, my attention was arrested by the many evidences that were continually looming up before me of the enormous squandering of public money in matters connected with the House expenses. I, therefore, determined to devote my attention to the whole subject, and, if possible, secure the attention of honorable members to the facts in the premises. In this, however, I was most sadly disappointed. I called the attention of several members to some of the more shameful abuses in regard

to the subject, but to no purpose. I became satisfied that this scandalous waste of money would never be stopped, or honestly inquired into, while the present party was in power. I, therefore, determined to give my efforts, humble as they are, to any party organization that would correct those abuses.

My object, therefore, in presenting the following facts and figures in relation to the expenditures of the House of Representatives, is to call the attention of the industrial classes of the country to the alarming profligacy and extravagances that are continually going on, and increasing to such enormous and frightful proportions, (and that too, under the very eyes of Congress) that, if not checked by the voice of the people, will soon reduce the laboring millions of this country to the most abject vassalage and dependence upon the will of the moneyed aristocracy of the country that is experienced by any people upon earth.

I hope, therefore, that my efforts, feeble as they are, may be of some service in arousing the honest laboring masses of the country to a realizing sense of their duty to themselves, their country, and their God, in the terrible struggle that is just beginning to stir the already troubled waters of political strife. *Remember that when the wicked rule the people mourn.* Let this Radical party, that is held together by the cohesive power of public plunder, be hurled from place and power with that terrible instrument, the ballot, that makes tyrants and pretenders tremble, when wielded by the hand of an honest, industrious, and an outraged people.

W. J. MANKER.



The public mind has become so accustomed to fraudulent and extravagant transactions in relation to the people's money, that it would seem almost useless to attempt to engage their attention to that subject at all. It is a matter of the most common occurrence to read accounts in the daily papers that A. B. or C. D., collector of customs, or some other position under the Government, for the collection or disbursement of the public money, has been discovered to be defaulter to a large amount, or that some whisky-ring has cheated the Government out of large sums of money by colluding with Government officials, or in some other of the thousand ways that dishonesty is so fruitful in inventing; all such announcements, however, are soon forgotten.

There must be some reason for this seeming want of a proper vigilance upon the part of the people upon a question of such vast importance to the material interest and permanent prosperity of the country. This seeming apathy arises from one of two causes: either the masses of the people are not informed as to the extent and magnitude of the shameless swindling that is continually going on in almost every department of the Government, or they have come to the conclusion to toil on and submit patiently to the enormous exactions that the *bondholders*, the capitalists, and the moneyed aristocracy of the country—and last, but not least, in the list of public plunderers, the law-makers of the land and the officers of the Government, whose duty it is to protect the interests of the people—may demand of them. It looks as though each one who has an opportunity to swindle is vying with the other to outstrip his fellows in deeds of the darkest and most villainous swindling, as I shall, humiliating as it is, be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of all candid minds:

If the people have concluded to toil on and still furnish this army of swindlers with supplies to glut their insatiable thirst for personal gain, it is with a hope that they, like the leech that hangs upon the living body and feeds upon the vital fluid until its once lank and flabby form, from very plethora, drops in disgust from the body that furnished the supply. But as yet we see no indications of the swindling crew following the example of the leech; on the contrary, we see every man of them ready to again do battle against the people's interests in endeavoring to perpetuate the power of the present ruling party, the *bondholders'* party, that has already brought the Government to a state of bankruptcy, and oppressed the industrial laboring millions of this country with exactions, in the shape of taxation, to an extent unheard of before, and without a parallel in the history of the civilized world, while the capital of the country has to a great extent been exempt from taxation. Banks have been instituted

at the bidding of that same capital, with privileges and immunities unheard of before—the whole action of the Government tending to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

It must be borne in mind that the *last* grain kicks the beam. This should be an admonition to the party in power, I mean the Republican party. It is said that history repeats itself. That being the case, we have only to look back a few years, and call the events of this brief period to mind to determine the fate of the party in power. It is within the recollection of many that the party in power in 1840 and 1860 lost the confidence of the people; whether right or wrong it is not necessary to stop to inquire. The facts are, the people had lost confidence in the ruling party more on account of the extravagance and the tendency, as the people believed, to concentrate and perpetuate, in the hands of dishonest and designing men, the control of public affairs. The terrible rebuke administered to the party in power then, has been lost sight of and forgotten by the party now in power.

Remember that history repeats itself, and the same causes will bring the same fate to the ruling party now, that overtook those in former years. The same fiery indignation that hurled parties from power in former years will, with a power equaled only by the fierce and mighty tempest, led onward in its desolating course by the lightning's flash, as a messenger of approaching danger, and driven by the more terrifying peals of the deep-toned thunder which proclaims His own majestic power, and defies resistance or control, overtake and overwhelm the Republicans, unless the confidence of the people can again be restored by a thorough reform in public affairs by the party now in power. Its days are numbered. The handwriting is already seen upon the wall. Reform is impossible without a change in parties. A change is demanded and will be made. Hurl from place and power the party that has become the mere tool of the bondholders and the moneyed aristocrats of the land.

That once proud party that held in its hands the destinies of the civilized world, and had for its votaries the master intellects of the age; that proud party that broke in pieces the bonds of four million human beings; that proud party that sustained the country through the terrible war that threatened the destruction of Republican government, and to whom the laboring classes looked with bright hopes for the future, has degenerated into the willing tool for dishonest and designing men. The interests of the laboring classes have been forgotten. The widow and the uncared-for children of the gallant soldier who fell in defense of the country, are turned aside with the pittance allowed them by law, in a depreciated currency, while the rich bondholder is paid in

gold; the poor widow is taxed heavily upon her mite, while the bondholder is exempt from all taxation, and the voice that is raised in favor of equal taxation is soon drowned by the more stentorian yells and shouts of *repudiation* by the bondholders and their friends. Will this condition of things be permitted to continue? Let the people answer at the ballot box at the next election.

The subject of public expenditures is one in which the people have a greater interest than any one subject that can be brought to their attention, and especially so at this time, on account of the enormously high taxes, both State and National. These high taxes speak in thunder tones upon the subject of public expenditures, and ought to be a sufficient reason with those who control the expenditures to use all the economy in this respect that is possible; for the people themselves know but little about the management, in detail of public affairs. All they fully realize is the terrible burdens that they, from year to year, are required to bear. My object, therefore, will be to shed some light upon the subject of public expenses. This inquiry, however, will be confined mainly to the expenditures at the Capitol, and especially the House of Representatives. I select this particular branch of the Government for the reason that it is under the immediate control of Congress, and as a test of party honesty and integrity. The party, therefore, can not go back on its own record upon this subject, as there is no other department of the Government to share the responsibility.

Whatever that record discloses, be it good or bad, it is the record of the party, and no effort upon the part of the party majority, in Congress or out of it, will be able to shift or avoid all the responsibilities that can attach to their action upon that subject. If the examination of the contingent and other expenses of the House, develop an extravagant waste of the public money, the people will know who to hold responsible. Those affected by the publication of the facts have no just cause to complain, for they made the record themselves. If, in the examination that I propose to make, I shall show the existence of a ring of swindlers, more dark and infamous than the whisky-rings of New York, I trust I shall have the sympathy of all honest men, whether in or out of Congress, whether Republicans or Democrats.

*A statement showing the expenses of the House of Representatives for the years ending June 30, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868:*

Year ending June 30, 1864.....	\$353,630.00
" " " 1865.....	481,884.00
" " " 1866.....	462,438.00
" " " 1867.....	502,081.00
" " " 1868.....	725,555.00
Additional compensation.....	100,000.00
Total.....	\$2,625,588.00

It will be seen that the expenses of the House increased so enormously, for the last

five years, that 1868 amounts to \$725,555.00 more than doubling that of 1864. This increase can not be accounted for upon the grounds of necessity, or even decency. Instead of this wonderful increase, as shown by the foregoing table, every principle of honesty, and a decent respect for the interest, happiness, and welfare of a toiling, tax-ridden, and confiding constituency, demanded a reduction rather than an increase, and I do not hesitate in asserting that the contingent and officers' salary expenses can, with great propriety, be reduced even below that of 1864, without any detriment to the public service. Instead of a reduction, however, for the year ending June 30, 1869, there will be quite an increase over that of 1863, as any one who has observed with any care the tendency of the present Congress to extravagance, and a most shameful, and I might with propriety say willful and criminal, disregard of the high trust confided to them as Representatives of the people.

To avoid any misunderstanding in regard to the foregoing items of expenses, I want it impressed upon the minds of all who care to know, that not one cent of the regular pay or mileage of members of Congress is included in the foregoing table. The salary of members of Congress is \$5,000 a year and twenty cents per mile for traveling from their homes to Washington and returning. For instance, if a member of Congress lives five hundred miles from the Capitol, he receives mileage for one thousand miles each session during his term, and an appropriation is made each year for that purpose. For the year ending June 30, 1863, the sum of \$1,100,000.00 was appropriated. It will be seen that the whole expenses of the House of Representatives for the year ending June 30, 1863, are \$1,825,555.

My purpose, however, is to examine the contingent fund and officers' salary fund. The officers of the House, who receive annual salaries, are paid from the salary fund. All others in the service of the House receive their pay from the contingent fund. With this explanation in regard to the several funds, which I regard as important to a correct understanding of the subject under consideration, I shall proceed to examine in detail, to some extent, the manner and objects for which the contingent fund is used; and in order to demonstrate and prove what I have already intimated, the most disgraceful and shameful use of the people's money, I shall be compelled, greatly against my wishes, to give the names of quite a number of distinguished gentlemen who have figured somewhat in making too free a use of public money, or permitting others to do so, when they should have discharged with more fidelity the high and holy obligations resting upon them, as Representatives and protectors of the people, against all such abuses, when it was within their power to prevent it. I can assure those gentlemen and others connected with the matter, that I am not



actuated with any feelings of unkindness or hostility toward them, and I feel quite sure that they can have no cause whatever for the least ill-feeling or "unpleasantness" towards me, for I shall be exceedingly careful to stick to the record that they themselves have made, and such other evidence as can not be gain-said or disputed. With this understanding, I feel that I will have the sympathy and kind regard of all concerned.

The first item that I propose to examine is the item of stationery, and in order to make the matter plain and forcible, I shall institute comparisons. It is said that comparisons are odious things; that, however, depends upon circumstances. If those I make are odious, the fault is not mine.

Stationery for 1868.....	\$77,500.00	
Commutation of stationery for 1863.....	22,150.00	
		\$99,650.00
Stationery for 1864.....	\$36,600.00	
Commutation of stationery for 1864.....	2,000.00	
		38,600.00
Excess of 1868 over 1864.....		\$61,050.00

This table exhibits the startling fact that the item of stationery for 1868 cost \$61,000 more than for 1864.

Let us examine that difference and see, if we can, what reasons, if any, could have made it necessary for this increase of cost in this item. It can not be that more stationery was required for the use of the House in 1868 than 1864, for there were no more members in Congress in 1868 than there were in 1864; nor can it be that stationery cost nearly 200 per cent. more in 1868 than in 1864. That surely is not the case, for, if I remember correctly, paper of all kinds was much higher in 1864, when it cost for the use of the House only \$38,000, than it was in 1868, when it cost \$99,650. The difference in the cost is certainly a matter of sufficient interest to inquire into with some care, and were it not for the fact that the honorable members of Congress have so many other matters of more weighty importance to look after—such, for instance, as the *impeachment of the President*; the regulating the powers and duties of the mayor and city council of Washington in such a way as to be sure that the appointing power is always in the hands of loyal men, so that none but the Simon Pure shall be the recipients of favors in the way of laboring upon the streets of said city at public expense; the objecting of Miss Ream from the Capitol on account of her holding opinions adverse to the majority in the House upon the subject of impeachment of the President; or upon the more important question as to whether Mr. Woolley did actually purchase three honorable Senators for the President with that \$17,000 that was found in some old safe, after the President was acquitted of the charge of high crime and misdemeanor, notwithstanding the honorable managers sent one of their number to the realms of infinite wisdom, through the hole in the skies, to learn wisdom whereby

they might convict the President, (I believe it was a failure, after all that trouble;) and various and sundry other *most* important matters to claim and occupy their precious time—they would, I doubt not, take vigorous steps to look after and inquire into this trifling difference of only \$61,050 in the cost of paper or stationery for the use of the House. An additional reason for not looking into such matters is perhaps the want of time and adequate compensation. For it will be borne in mind that their salaries, as fixed by law, are only about \$3,000 per annum, at twenty cents per mile for traveling expenses to and from the Capitol, and only \$5,000 and the mileage paid in money, the balance in trade, such as books, paper, gold pens, pocket knives, scissors, gold pencils, visiting cards of the latest French style, and various other articles too tedious to mention; and then to think of it again, their time is limited to only twelve months in the year, and they are elected for but two years at a time. Under such circumstances, who would be so unreasonable as to expect them to look after such small matters as the contingent expenses of the House, and especially so when they have so vigilant, conscientious, and close-listed a Committee on Accounts as the present, as an examination of their disbursements for the House and their connection with it will abundantly show by the time we get through.

It will be seen by an examination of table marked "A" that the House expenses for the year 1865 increased over that of 1864.....					\$123,254
Ditto	1866	"	"	"	108,808
Ditto	1867	"	"	"	148,451
Ditto	1868	"	"	"	371,925

Aggregate increase in four years..... \$757,438

while the average increase per year for the last four years is \$184,359.50

The increase of 1868 over that of 1864, is the enormous sum of \$371,925, or double that of 1864, and \$16,295 over.

There are many very interesting facts and items connected with the disbursements of the House funds for the years 1865, 1866 and 1867, but the limits that I have prescribed for the examination of this subject, will not permit so wide a range. I shall therefore content myself, and at the same time I trust that the demands of justice will be amply met, by an analysis of the subject for the years 1864 and 1868, and particularly 1868.

The comparisons that have already been made are sufficient to show the most profigate and unjustifiable waste and extravagant use, or rather squandering of the people's money, and that too, in many cases, without the authority of law or even common decency, and resting solely for a justification upon the mere acquiescence of the Committee of Accounts for their legality, or rather upon a custom that is both vicious and dishonest, that has been allowed to grow up in the last few years in matters connected with the business

of the House, until its proportions have become so great, and its capacity for swallowing the people's money so wonderful, that it demands almost an equal share of the contingent fund with the legitimate business of the House.

I will now return to the item of stationery, and endeavor to finish that subject without further digression.

I will now introduce Table B to the attention of the reader, as a continuation of the stationery subject. This table is compiled from House Mis. Doc. No. 31, 2d Session 40th Congress (Clerk's Report):

TABLE B.

734 Gold pens.....	\$2,908.89
1,736 Gross steel pens.....	1,886.84
152 Boxes.....	165.65
Quill pens.....	124.70
	<hr/>
2,786 Penknives.....	\$5,086.08
540 Pairs scissors.....	5,620.00
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$11,287.08

The items in the foregoing table are included in the stationery account of 1863, and my object in presenting them in this form is two-fold; first, to let the public know to a certainty that which has been but vague rumor, that penknives, gold pens, &c., are bought with the public money; second, to sustain what I before stated, that this financial and disbursing committee are remarkable for their prudence and interest in the expenditure of the people's money.

I find, upon a close examination of the document referred to, that eighty-six of the pocket knives were purchased expressly for the use of the Clerk's office, at a cost of \$250.00, some of them costing as much as \$10.50 each; forty-six pairs of scissors were also purchased for the use of the same office at a cost of about \$50.00; thirty-one gold pens were appropriated to the use of the Clerk's office at a cost of \$165.00, some of them costing as high as \$18.50. (See page 226 of the Doc. referred to, Clerk's report.) The whole amount of stationery purchased would be equal to about \$520.00 to each member of Congress. But it will be said that the paper used for book folding is included in the bill; that is true, no doubt; but will any sane man say that one hundred dollars' worth of wrapping paper would not be ample to wrap all the books that one member of Congress is allowed. I have no doubt that forty dollars' worth would be quite ample for that purpose.

That being the case, and adding the \$40 to the stationery allowed by law to each member, would make the stationery allowed each one as follows:

Stationery, proper, allowed.....	\$150.00
Wrapping paper.....	40.00
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$190.00

Making a total amount of paper for use of members, \$38,000 dollars, leaving \$61,650 for

other purposes. But let us look after the seven hundred and three gold pens still remaining undisposed of, saying nothing about the cart load of steel and quill pens on hand.

The gold pens are valued, as per bill, at \$2,743.89, or about \$15.00 to each member. Is it reasonable to suppose that the members have bought all this \$2,743 worth of pens?

It is due to the members to state that all the stationery that they draw as members is charged to them—or that is the law; and if they draw more than is allowed them, they are required to pay for it. The two thousand seven hundred penknives still remaining must also be accounted for; their value, as per bill, is \$5,370.00.

Let us see what disposition we can make of them. The value of the knives is about \$25.50 to each member. If they were equally divided among them, they would be entitled to about fifteen knives each. I now propound the same question that I did in the case of the pens. I do not suppose any one would be foolish enough to even think, much less say, that these knives were bought by the members. Upon the contrary, I assert, without the fear of successful contradiction, that not even one-half of the knives, scissors and gold pens left, after the Clerk's office was supplied, was ever drawn by members of Congress. This proposition I shall prove most conclusively by such evidence as will not be questioned by any one. The whole cost of the knives, gold pens and scissors, as shown in Table B, is \$11,287; amount used by Clerk's office, \$465; leaving \$10,822 to be used by members, or accounted for through them. By an examination of the Clerk's report, it will be seen that about \$8,000 worth of stationery proper, was all that was actually drawn by them; the balance, about \$22,000, to make up the \$30,000 to which they were entitled, was drawn in money, as commutation for stationery not actually drawn by them.

It is fair to presume, that the members would, on an average, draw at least thirty dollars' worth of actual writing materials, such as paper, envelopes, &c., that, in the aggregate, would amount to \$6,000, there being two hundred members, including the territorial delegates. It will be seen by this calculation, that \$2,000 is all that could be drawn by members, unless they should overdraw their accounts, a thing that is never done, or at least the Clerk's report, in which these items are found, gives no instance of the kind. I think the proposition that the members did not draw those articles, is proven by the foregoing facts beyond cavil or doubt.

According to the foregoing calculations, it will be seen that there are nearly \$62,000 worth of stationery left, after supplying the folding room, and the amounts allowed by law to individual members. It will also be kept in mind, that there are still \$3,822



worth of penknives, gold pens and scissors not disposed of, nor can we find out what has become of them. We know, from the Clerk's report, the amount drawn by the Postmaster, who is the agent for selling and distributing the stationery to members; but we have no report of what the Postmaster did with it. It may be said that a large amount of stationery, including gold pens, &c., was left to run over for another year. That, I undertake to say, is not the case, for, in looking over the reports of former years in respect to the contingent expenses of the House, it will be seen that the same shameful and extravagant purchases are made each year. For the year ending June, 1867, the stationery account was even more scandalous than in 1868. The stationery that year, 1867, was :

Stationery purchased, about.....	\$85,000.00
Commutation of stationery.....	20,000.00
Total.....	\$105,000.00

and the purchases of penknives, gold pens, scissors, &c., were as extravagant in 1867 as in 1868. There were none of those articles left over in 1867, I am authorized by the facts to say; for if there had been a supply left over, the purchases for 1868 would not have been made.

I therefore conclude, and I think for the best of reasons, that the supplies purchased for each year are always exhausted, and an examination of the Clerk's reports for the last six years will demonstrate that fact beyond question; for each year's purchase exhibits the same profligate extravagance. It may be said, however, that the supplies to committees of the House have exhausted or used up the \$61,000 worth of stationery, including the penknives, gold pens, scissors, &c. I should very much regret to know that to be true, for it would place the honorable members of committees in the most unenviable position before the public in which it would be possible to place any honorable man. If it be true, however, that this vast amount of stationery, including gold pens, &c., has been drawn by the committees, the public ought to know it, and to know the fact would most certainly bring down upon them the just and merited indignation of an outraged people; for such an act upon the part of committees would be nothing short of robbery, and the pirate upon the high seas or the highwayman would become, comparatively speaking, respectable beside them. I do not believe that the committees are guilty of any such thing. It is true, however, that the committees are entitled to and do draw all the stationery they need for the purpose of transacting the public business, and it sometimes happens that great abuses occur, unknown to the members; but that an amount of stationery exceeding by \$23,000 the entire amount used by the House for the year 1864, was used by

the committees, is too startling to be entertained for one moment. But what becomes of this vast amount of stationery is a question that ought, in justice to the people, to be inquired after, in connection with other expenditures even more startling and unjustifiable, as I shall be able to show before I am through with the subject under consideration. I shall, for the present, dismiss the item of stationery, as I will have occasion to refer to it again, in connection with other items.

The next item that I propose to examine is the expenditure connected with the office of Sergeant-at-Arms, N. G. Ordway, officer. As a starting point in this branch of my inquiries, I append the following exhibit:

*Amounts received by N. G. Ordway, Sergeant-at-Arms, as per Clerk's Report, January 1, 1868, (26 Mis. Doc. No. 31, 2d Sess. 40th Congress.)*

PAGE		
14	Committee on Public Expenditures...	\$700.80
21	Do New Orleans riots.....	1,987.12
34	Do Internal revenue frauds.....	1,161.93
46	Do Item.....	100.00
47	Committee on Funeral of P. Johnson.....	2,144.65
47 & 48	Do Southern railroads.....	1,763.00
50	Do Judiciary.....	1,620.00
51	Do Indian Affairs.....	712.80
52	Do For arrests on call of House.....	577.20
52	Do Case of assault on W. H. Painter.....	263.27
52	Do Case of C. V. Culver.....	240.10
52	Do Crape in case of death of Grider.....	200.40
53	Committee on Naval Affairs.....	133.00
53	Do Horse-car tickets.....	56.84
53	Do Cash paid Whaley.....	50.00
53	Do Summoning witnesses.....	24.25
53	Committee on Naval Affairs.....	359.55
59	Do New Orleans riots.....	2,392.40
60	Do Public Expenditures.....	2,192.60
141 & 142	Do Judiciary.....	3,773.80
143	Do Judiciary.....	110.00
143	Do Judiciary.....	264.00
189 & 199	Do Judiciary.....	1,236.90
191 & 192	Do Pay Department.....	1,096.80
192, 3 & 4	Do Prisoners of war.....	1,955.00
195 & 196	Do Elections.....	1,235.23
196 & 197	Do Pay Department.....	371.81
198	Do Judiciary.....	244.40
	Do Horse and carriage and street railroad tickets for the year ending January, 1868.....	916.84
195	Committee on Pay Department.....	365.25
	Do Salaries for Sergeant-at-Arms, Clerk and Assistant.....	6,912.00
	Do Estimated temporary assistants.....	3,000.00
		\$38,169.13

It will be seen that the foregoing exhibit is prepared in the same order that the several charges appear in the document referred to; my object in this is to facilitate an examination of the items, if any one should have the curiosity to do so. In the analyzing process to which I propose to subject the several items in the exhibit, as well as the expenditures of the committees, I shall have frequent occasion to refer to them.

The following bill of expenditures may be



found on page 14 of the Clerk's report I give also the charges of all connected with the committees upon this occasion, except witnesses.

<b>N. G. ORDWAY</b> —Travel from Washington to Boston and return with documents for Committee on Public Expenditures, 960 miles.....		\$96.40
Board, in September and October, 1866, with committee.....		222.00
4 travels from Warner, N. H., to Boston, 450 miles.....		45.00
2 travels from Holderness, N. H., to New York, 550 miles.....		55.00
Paid for rooms to take testimony.....		93.00
Paid for stationery.....		69.50
Paid for hack-hire.....		24.25
Paid for telegrams.....		75.06
Paid for procuring testimony.....		21.00
		<hr/>
		\$700.81
<b>C. T. HULBURD</b> —Board and expenses as chairman of Committee on Public Expenditures during recess of 39th Congress, 43 days at Boston and New York.....		258.00
4 travels from Boston to Brashear Falls, N. Y., 1,480 miles.....		148.00
3 travels from Brashear Falls, N. Y., to New York city, 1,200 miles.....		120.00
1 travel from Boston to New York, 240 miles.....		24.00
		<hr/>
		\$550.00
<b>E. H. ROLLINS</b> —Board and expenses as member of Committee on Public Expenditures during recess of 39th Congress, 29 days, at \$6.....		174.00
4 travels from Concord, N. H., to Boston, 450 miles.....		45.00
5 days' expenses examining testimony..		30.00
		<hr/>
		\$249.00
<b>H. G. HAYES</b> —Board and expenses in Boston and New York as stenographer for Committee on Public Expenditures, 19 days, at \$6.....		114.00
2 travels from New York to Boston and return, 944 miles.....		94.20
		<hr/>
		\$208.40
<b>F. H. SMITH</b> —Board and expenses in Boston as reporter for Committee on Public Expenditures, 14 days, at \$6.....		84.00
Travel from Washington to Boston and return, 942 miles.....		94.40
		<hr/>
		\$184.40

On page 60 I find the following charges (omitting the names) for services for the Committee on Public Expenditures:

N. G. ORDWAY—Summoning witnesses...\$2,192.60

The number of witnesses summoned upon this occasion was 36, for which he was entitled to \$2 for each witness. Serving the 36 would be \$72. Deducting the \$72 will leave \$2,120.60. This amount was received by Ordway for mileage. The charge would indicate that he had traveled 21,206 miles. By looking at the first charge, however, we find that he is paid 1,960 miles more, making in all 23,166 miles.

I have always understood that when public officers were allowed mileage, it was to cover all personal expenses. And the law in regard to the duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House provides that that officer shall receive ten cents per mile for each mile ne-

cessarily and actually traveled in executing any process of the House. If the law means anything, it means that the officer shall receive no more pay than for the distance necessarily and actually traveled. No one, I presume, will be foolish enough to suppose even that the Sergeant-at-Arms traveled 23,160 miles actual and necessary travel, in connection with his duties for the committee upon that occasion. And for the purpose of comprehending more readily the vastness of the distance, we will call it trip No. 1 around the globe; and as there will be quite a number of such trips developing themselves during this inquiry, I desire that No. 1 be kept in mind. The board bill for Mr. Ordway is not set out definitely, but I think, from the character of the charges for board, that his bill would be, for thirty days, \$180. I think the charge for board in his account justifies that conclusion. The account, then, stands thus:

For mileage.....	\$2,316
Board thirty days, at \$6.....	180
Total.....	<hr/>
	\$2,496

This charge bears upon its face the evidence of fraud most base; but as it is, perhaps, the most decent and respectable of any of his charges, I will refrain from making further comment until his whole record is placed before us, except such as may incidentally arise during the presentation of the fact. When that is done, however, I will endeavor to show the vile dishonesty and the outrageous swindling that runs through his whole batch of charges, and give my opinion as to where the responsibility rests.

The next in order is the New Orleans riot committee. (See page 21, same Doc.)

THOS. B. CHENEY—Expenses on trip with Select Committee on Affairs in Louisi- ana and New Orleans Riots:	
Expenses from Washington to New Or- leans and return.....	\$555.15
Hack-hire, carriages, etc.....	266.00
Telegrams.....	128.79
Stationery.....	53.98
Parlors and other expenses at St. Louis Hotel, used by committee for examin- ing witnesses.....	434.40
J. F. Mollers, services as detective.....	105.00
3,159 miles' travel from Washington to New Orleans and return.....	315.90
Board and expenses, 16 days, at \$8.....	128.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,987.12

In this case Mr. Cheney is acting Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

On page 59 the following additional charge appears, in connection with this committee, the names of witnesses omitted. N. G. Ordway, summoning witnesses, \$2,392.40. Number of witnesses summoned in this case, 300, for which he is entitled to \$600 for service, without mileage; deduct the \$600, will leave 17,924 miles as having been traveled in summoning the witnesses; add to this 3,159 miles for travel from Washington to New Orleans and return, the account will stand as follows, to wit:

Summoning witnesses.....	\$2,392.40
Sixteen days' board, at \$8.....	128.00
Mileage going and returning.....	315.90
One-fifth of \$555.15.....	111.03
Total.....	\$2,947.33

The same scandalous charge in relation to mileage occurs in this case, as in the first, making trip No. 2 around the globe. There is lack of distance in this case, but in others, as will be seen, he has quite a lap-over in the travel; for convenience, therefore, we give him the lap-over in these cases, so that no injustice will be done the honorable Sergeant-at-Arms.

There is a feature in this case that does not appear in the first, which is this: "Expenses from Washington to New Orleans and return, \$555.15." This charge is most remarkable, when we examine all the charges connected with this committee. For what was this \$555.15 paid? The members of the committee charge mileage, and board at \$8 per day; so do the clerks and every other person connected with the trip, except, perhaps, one messenger, whose name does not appear in the case.

I find that any extended notice in each case would occupy too much space and tire the patience of the reader. I shall, therefore, give the cases with but little comment, until they are all presented.

The next case in order is the following, found on page 34 Clerk's report:

N. G. ORDWAY—Expenses on account of Committee on Frauds in Internal Revenue, December, 1866, and January, 1867:	
Parlors and rooms used for examining witnesses at Astor House, New York	\$342.75
Parlors, rooms, etc., at Continental Hotel, Philadelphia.....	104.75
Stationery.....	62.85
A. McCloud, for copy of record.....	20.00
Carriage-hire, car-fare, etc.....	219.94
Telegrams, etc.....	27.14
Two trips, Washington to New York and return, 940 miles' travel.....	94.00
One trip, Washington to Philadelphia and return, 280 miles' travel.....	28.00
Twenty-nine days' board, at \$6 per day..	174.00
Seven days' board for Hemple in Philadelphia.....	31.50
One trip to New York and return, 470 miles' travel.....	47.00
	\$1,151.93

It will be seen that the item of board is still prominent in this case, reduced in price, however, \$2 per day.

The next case is the charges of Mr. Ordway, in connection with the Judiciary Committee:

PAGES.	
48, 49, Summoning witnesses.....	\$1,620.00
141, 142, Summoning witnesses.....	3,773.80
143, Travel for committee.....	206.00
143, 28 days' board, at \$6.....	168.00
189, 190, 191, Summoning witnesses.....	1,236.90
198, By Department travel.....	94.40
25 days' board, at \$6.....	150.00
	\$7,249.10

In this case there were 220 witnesses sum-

moned, which would be, for service, \$440. The account stands as follows:

Mileage, 64,911 miles.....	\$6,491.19
Serving process.....	440.00
53 days' board.....	318.00
	\$7,249.10

This case requires no comment. It stands out in such bold relief that he who runs can but read.

*Where is thy shame, O man!* Thinkst thou not that a day of reckoning will come? Will the people, the toiling millions of this country, still sleep and permit such outrages as this to continue? Although a profligate Congress may give to such charges the semblance of legality, in order to prevent a conviction for robbery or theft before the courts of justice, the people will arraign the perpetrators of all such acts, and the Congress that allows them, before the bar of public justice, from which there is no appeal, and the terrible sentence of an outraged and incensed people will sweep from place and power all who have thus proved themselves unworthy of the sacred trust confided to them by an honest and industrious constituency.

The mileage in this case is most astounding. Think of it, reader; 64,911 miles—a distance almost equal to three times around the globe! We shall, therefore, call this stupendous travel "Trip No. 3, 4 and 5 around the globe." Does any body believe the distance charged for in this case was actually traveled? I leave the answer for the reader. I must leave this case for the present.

As an examination in detail of each case in Mr. Ordway's account would not only occupy more space than the limits of this work would permit, and the reader would become wearied in perusing it, I shall give but a few more at length. I will recapitulate the mileage, in order that the reader may see, at a glance, the enormity of that branch of the gentleman's service:

	MILES.
Committee on Public Expenditures.....	23,160
Committee on New Orleans Riot.....	21,083
Committee on Revenue Frauds.....	1,690
Funeral of Hon. P. Johnson.....	1,850
Committee on Southern Railroads.....	17,170
Committee on Indian Affairs.....	6,968
On call of the House.....	222
Case of Painter Culver.....	2,550
Several cases.....	1,530
Committee on Judiciary.....	64,911
Committee on Prisoners of War.....	19,000
Committee on Pay Department.....	12,000
Estimated traveling, not included above, by assistants.....	17,000
Total miles traveled.....	208,433

The foregoing table is believed to be as near correct as it is possible to ascertain from the report. The last item is estimated, but believed to be true; the others are correct, as they were taken from the charges themselves. Any one who may wish, can make the calculations for themselves.

In order to fully comprehend the vast dis-



tance charged as having been traveled by the Sergeant-at-Arms and his assistants, in connection with their official duties, I shall make a comparison with the circumference of the *earth* or *globe* as to distance. The earth is said to be 24,000 miles in circumference. The distance traveled, as charged for, would be equal to eight trips around the earth and 16,403 miles, or two-thirds of the way on the ninth trip. It would be an insult to an intelligent public to ask any one to believe that this immense distance was traveled by Mr. Ordway and his assistants in connection with their official duties. I have no idea that one-third of the distance was actually and necessarily traveled.

In addition to this unmitigated swindle in regard to this mileage charge, this same man has the audacity, impudence, and hardihood to present board bills in amount to over \$2,000; and by reference to the bills it will be seen that \$6 per day is charged in every case but one, the New Orleans riot, in which case he charges \$8, and from the character of the charges in that case, I have no doubt but his car fare was paid out of the public money also.

The question naturally arises by whom are those scandalous, swindling accounts allowed? I will state now that all such accounts are made out by the officer to whom they are due, and are by him then presented to the Committee of Accounts, where they receive the finishing touch, that entitles the holder to draw the money. As I shall have occasion in a separate chapter, to show where the responsibility rests, I will leave that question for the present.

The next case I shall present is more villainous, if possible, than any that have preceded it. I most especially invite the attention of members of Congress to this charge, as I regard it good for both instruction and reproof.

**N. G. ORDWAY.**—Fees and expenses in arresting, bringing before the House, and discharging the following named members of Congress for being absent without leave: G. W. Anderson, A. A. Barker, J. F. Benjamin, H. P. H. Bromwell, J. W. Chambers, J. H. Defrees, B. Eggleston, E. Hise, A. J. Kuykendall, H. Maynard, J. S. Morrill, J. W. Patterson, F. A. Pike, A. H. Rice, L. H. Rousseau, T. N. Stillwell, A. Thornton, H. D. Washburn, Wm. Windom, S. T. Holmes, J. A. Kasson, S. S. Marshall, E. R. V. Wright, J. A. Bingham, J. F. Farnsworth, E. C. Ingersoll, C. H. Winfield, J. G. Blaine, J. W. Chanler, R. Hart, J. M. Marvin, S. McKee, T. M. Pomeroy, H. Ward, Wm. B. Stokes, L. Rousseau, William D. Kelley, Samuel McKee, Portus Baxter, J. Bidwell, E. P. Buckland, H. L. Dawes, C. Delano, C. Goodyear, J. R. Hubbell, G. R. Latham, H. McCullough, S. W. Moulton, S. Perham, T. A. Plants, J. H. Rice, C. Sitgreaves, Wm. B. Stokes, H. Ward, William B. Washburn, J. M. Ashley, S. Hooper, G. V. Lawrence, I. C. Sloan, F. E. Woodbridge, A. Brandagee, J. A. Griswold, William Radford, G. W. Anderson, H. P. H. Bromwell, H. L. Dawes, J. R. Hubbell,

H. Maynard, J. K. Moorhead, S. F. Wilson, A. Thornton, T. M. Stillwell, L. W. Ross, J. W. Patterson, J. D. Baldwin, F. C. Beaman, J. G. Blaine, H. S. Bundy, J. L. Dawson, E. R. Eckley, R. Hart, William D. Kelley, J. M. Marvin, J. K. Morehead, G. S. Orth, C. E. Phelps, T. M. Pomeroy, L. W. Ross, J. F. Starr, J. L. Thomas, Jr., S. L. Warner, S. F. Wilson, T. T. Davis, E. N. Hubbell, B. F. Loan, A. H. Ward, J. Wentworth, H. C. Deming, R. S. Hale, H. J. Raymond, J. D. Baldwin, H. S. Bundy, J. H. Defrees, G. R. Latham, H. McCullough, C. E. Phelps, W. B. Washburn, J. L. Thomas, Jr., C. Sitgreaves, E. C. Ingersoll, F. A. Pike, at \$5.20 each.....\$577 20

I am informed that the call of the House that brought this bill into existence, occurred near the close of the Thirty-Ninth Congress. I insert the entire bill, including the names, in order that no honorable member of Congress shall have the least cause to complain of me for not giving him ample justice in the premises, as each of them are, to some extent, interested in the case. The twenty cents charge in the bill is for mileage. Upon a close examination, it will be seen that that model and modest traveler, Mr. Ordway, charges and receives for his services upon that occasion, the very modest sum of \$577.20. In addition to the arrest and discharge of the honorable members, he charges for traveling 222 miles.

The whole distance traveled by every one connected with the arrests did not exceed five miles, and that was done by doorkeepers, who received no additional pay for their services. But this man Ordway, the celebrated traveler, who gets \$5 each for arresting the members of Congress, and who, it is said, never went out of the Capitol, presents his modest little claim to the Committee on Accounts, who scanned it with the care peculiar to them in such matters, and who being satisfied that the Sergeant-at-Arms ought to be well paid for his arduous labor in that long and dreary night, with one accord agreed that he did actually travel two hundred and twenty-two miles, and ordered the disbursing officer to pay the account; and the traveler shouted, *Amen!*

The following bill is one of the most astonishing instances of extravagance and folly that can be found anywhere in this country. It is exceedingly difficult to determine where the responsibility rests for the extravagance in this case.

**N. G. ORDWAY.**—Expenses incurred on account of the death and burial of Hon. Philip Johnson, late a member of the House of Representatives, thirty-ninth Congress:

Hack hire, assistance in care of remains, and arranging for the funeral in the House of Representatives.....	\$50 00
18 white silk sashes for officers of House and Senate.....	254 00
8 black silk sashes for Committee of Arrangement.....	96 00
20 doz. kid gloves.....	615 00
2 doz. kid gloves.....	54 00
2 doz. kid gloves.....	60 00

1 doz. kid gloves .....	\$33 00
200 black crape scarfs .....	300 00
Travel of messenger to New York and return .....	47 00
Hacks to carry escort and friends to depot .....	16 00
Fare and expenses of escort and re- mains from Washington, D. C., to Easton, Pa. ....	245 00
Hotel bills and hacks at Easton....	42 65
Fare and expenses on return to Washington.....	194 00
Travel of Asst. Sergeant-at-Arms and two messengers, Washington to Easton and return, 460 miles each .....	138 00
	<u>2,144 65</u>

<b>L. WILLIAMS.</b> —Services and expen- ses as undertaker in care of re- mains of Philip Johnson:	
1 coffin .....	\$150 00
Case, plate and engraving.....	16 00
Laying out, &c. ....	15 00
Crape and gloves.....	20 00
Opening vault and attendance on funeral day .....	11 50
Hearse .....	10 00
4 hacks .....	32 00
6 hacks .....	42 00
2 hacks .....	16 00
2 hacks .....	14 00
5 hacks .....	15 00
2 hacks .....	14 00
Removing remains from vault to de- pot.....	20 00
Attendance with remains to Easton, Penn., and return.....	30 00
	<u>405 50</u>

<b>WILLIAM KEYS,</b> furnishing 70 hacks.....	420 00
Total .....	<u>\$2,970 15</u>

We can see in this, as in all other cases where Ordway has any hand in it, that everlasting mania for mileage. It would seem that a case with all the solemn surroundings of this, and an extravagance unheard of before, should have softened his feeling somewhat upon the question of filching money from the Treasury; but not so upon this occasion, for we see about \$500 charged as expenses going to Easton and returning to Washington; and I have no doubt that this charge covered all the expense of every person in any way connected with the escort: yet our eyes are saluted with that same charge for mileage that has been such a fruitful source of swindling and fraud in almost every case where Mr. Ordway has had to do.

In addition to all these villainous charges, Mr. Ordway receives an annual salary of \$2,592, and all of his assistants are receiving salaries from \$1,440 to \$2,160. This fact should be borne in mind in connection with the record in his case.

There are many things of interest still remaining in the charges against the Sergeant-at-Arms, to which I would very much like to call attention, but on account of so many other matters upon the subject under consideration that have not been even alluded to as yet, I will be compelled to drop Mr. Ordway at this point.

I now turn my attention to another branch of the inquiry, and I must say, in the outset, that this will exhibit, if possible, a more

damnable and outrageous state of things than either of the preceding inquiries. My subject will be carriage and horse-hire, cartage, &c.

For the purpose of showing the enormous increase of the House expenses, I will give the entire cost of the service under consideration for the years ending June 30, 1864, and June, 1868, in order that the outrageous character of the expenditures of 1868 may be the more forcibly presented to the mind:

Horse and carriage hire and cartage, 1868..	\$14,213 00
Horse and carriage hire and cartage, 1864..	6,594 00

Excess 1868 over 1864.....	\$7,619 00
----------------------------	------------

We will try now to inquire into the cause of this great increase. It cannot arise from an increased necessity, for there was no more business connected with this branch of the service in 1868 than there was in 1864. We will compare a few items in this matter, and see the difference. Take the item of hauling documents for the two years:

1868 there were.....	12,389 loads, at 50 cents.	\$6,194 50
1864 there were.....	3,166 loads; at 50 cents.	1,583 00

Excess of 1868....	9,283	\$4,641 50
--------------------	-------	------------

It will be seen that in this item alone, 1868 is more than four times greater than 1864, both in number of loads and cost to the Government. This difference is so glaringly outrageous and unjustifiable, that no one, I presume, will undertake to defend it. There were no more documents in 1868 than in 1864. Then why so great a difference in number of loads and the cost to the Government—the increase being more than 300 per cent? The question is easily solved, as in all other cases of such increase of similar items. It is simply an unmitigated swindle, not possessing a single element of honesty or fair dealing. And the officer who certifies to or approves such claims, and the committee who allows them, and the Congress that makes the appropriations to pay them, are all alike guilty of a willful or ignorant disregard of the interests committed to their care. If it be willful, they disgrace the positions they hold. If it be ignorance, they are unfit for the positions they occupy, and the sooner they are required to surrender the places they fill, the better it will be for the country. It matters not which horn of the dilemma they take. Either will place them in a position unfit to be intrusted with public affairs.

This is only one item in this branch of this subject. The next item to which I invite attention is, if possible, more scandalous than the one just examined.

The following is the bill for private horses and carriages for 1868. (See Clerk's Report:)

N. G. Ordway.....	\$916 84
Ed. Spicer.....	1,098 00
Ira Goodnow.....	515 00
Clinton Lloyd.....	2,523 00

Total.....	<u>\$5,152 84</u>
------------	-------------------



## For 1864:

Robert Morris.....	\$900 00
Ira Goodnow.....	1,491 25
E. Etheridge.....	14 00
C. Lloyd.....	60 00
Total.....	\$2,465 25
Excess of 1868 over 1864.....	\$2,687 59

I am sure that the bill for 1864 is much larger than it should have been, and especially the Doorkeeper's (Goodnow.) The Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Ball, had not received the inspiration that has filled our man Ordway so unutterably full, that it seems he is unable to comprehend anything except it has connected with it mileage, board, or horse and carriage-hire. Mr. Ball paid for his carriage riding with his own money, as all honest men would do under like circumstances. There was some reason and propriety in regard to this carriage-hire before the days of street railroads, but now all this whole bill is a huge swindle, and ought to be stopped at once. None of the document hauling for the Clerk's office is included in this bill for 1868. The whole bill is an outrage upon public decency, as I think I will be able to show.

Let us examine this bill of Clinton Lloyd. I will also carry Spicer's charge along with it:

C. LLOYD.—Use of 3 horses and carriages for Clerk's office, October, 1867.....	\$332 50
E. SPICER.—Use of 1 horse and wagon for October, 1867.....	\$77 50
Use of 1 saddle-horse for October, 1867.....	62 00
	\$139 50

It is very strange that three carriages and horses appear upon the record as the property of Lloyd. That, however, is a matter of taste, and it makes no difference, so far as the swindle upon the Government is concerned, whose name is used for the purpose of filching thousands upon thousands of dollars from the public treasury without any corresponding benefit to the Government. It is not worth while to mince the matter at all; it is simply an infamous and disgraceful swindle upon the Government, more scandalous than the whisky-ring operation that we hear so much of. It is none the less a swindle because the Committee of Accounts allow it. This only aggravates and blackens the act. It will loom up before an honest people as a double-headed monster, bearing the inscription "Falsehood" upon one head and "swindlers" upon the other. This whole bill is for private carriages and horses.

The bill, as it appears upon the record, is very far from giving it correctly.

Bill as it really is:

Horse and carriage hire, cartage, &c.....	\$15,123 50
One watchman at stable.....	1,000 00
One superintendent at stable.....	1,440 00
Four laborers.....	3,000 00
Total.....	\$20,563 50

There is another thought in relation to this matter that might be looked after to some profit; that is, in regard to those two horses that are charged as being furnished by Ed. Spicer. It might turn out that he had no horse at all. As much has been intimated in regard to that matter, I simply call attention to it. The Doorkeeper, Chas. E. Lippincott, has one horse, I believe, and it might be that that horse has been magnified into two horses, in the name of Spicer. This would not astonish me if it should turn out to be the case, as I have heard of other "ground and lofty tumbling" about the Folding-room, the headquarters of Mr. Spicer. As that department will receive some attention in the proper place, I will leave it for the present.

## POST OFFICE.

I shall now pay my respects to the House Post Office. I shall be as brief as the nature of the case will allow.

There is quite a large force of men and horses belonging to this department. Mr. King is the Postmaster, and for aught I know to the contrary, he is a very excellent officer; but as I intend going through the House end of the Capitol, and not wishing to show partiality, or seem unsocial, I will drop a few hints by way of reminder, that "all is not gold that glitters." *Stick a pin there, Mr. Postmaster.*

By way of introduction, I would ask the name of the mail contractor in the House Post Office, as I have heard some suspicions about foul play upon one S. H. Dunham, who appears upon the record as the man who carries the mail and hauls the documents, and upon inquiry of those around the stable, men who feed and take care of the horses, none of them were able to tell anything about Mr. Dunham; they say that Messrs. King and Stevens are the contractors. In my inquiries in this department, I regard Mr. Dunham as a myth, for such I believe him to be; I shall therefore regard Mr. King, the Postmaster, and Mr. Stevens, his chief clerk, as the real mail contractors.

I propose to analyze this mail service, for of all the monstrous abuses and swindles connected with the management of the business of the House, none are more enormous and unjustifiable than this service. By a reference to the Clerk's report, January, 1868, it will be seen that there are four horses and carryalls, at an expense of \$10 per day, kept the whole year, making \$3,650 00 per year, and in addition to these four horses and carryalls, which are for the letter mail, as it seems there are two other carryalls kept for the purpose of hauling documents from the House to the City Post Office or the depot. This document hauling for the year amounts to 10,569 loads, at a cost of \$5,284.50. This does not include the hauling of documents for the Clerk's office,

which was 1,321 loads, at a cost of \$910.50.

The cost of the mail service, including the document hauling, stands as follows:

4 horses and carryalls, at \$10 per day.....	\$3,650 00
Document hauling.....	5,284 50
Feed of horses.....	5,000 00
5 carryall and wagon drivers, at \$1.080 each per annum.....	5,400 00
Proportion of cost of tends at stable.....	1,500 00
Salary of postmaster.....	2,592 00
Assistant ".....	2,088 00
4 messengers, at \$1,723.00.....	6,912 00
Total.....	\$32,338 50

This table seems fabulous, yet every item is shown upon record, and can not be disputed, except the item of forage, which is estimated; but I believe the appropriations for that purpose justify the estimate that I have made; but leave that item out entirely, and the account is still so monstrous that it staggers belief.

The following statement, showing the expenditures of the committees named, is made up from H. Mis. Doc. No. 31, 2d session, 40th Congress. The subject-matter upon which they were required to act was mainly political in its nature. The immense expenditure of public money, occasioned by their appointment, has resulted in no benefit to the people. The only person who has been profited by them is high salaried officers, who sought their appointment as a means through which they might perpetuate their power, and at the same time appropriate to themselves large sums of the people's money. The statement, however, speaks for itself:

*Committee on the Treatment of Prisoners of War.*

J. P. C. Shanks, M. C., 118 days board at \$6.....	\$708 00
4,523 miles travel.....	452 00
	\$1,160 00
A. F. Stevens, M. C., 70 days board.....	\$429 00
80 miles travel.....	8 00
	423 00
Sergeant-at-Arms.....	2,136 57
Clerk, witnesses, etc.....	2,600 00
	\$6,224 57

*Judiciary Committee.*

Samuel S. Marshall, M. C., 58 days board.....	\$348 00
6,000 miles travel.....	600 00
	\$948 00
Jas. F. Wilson, M. C., 47 days board.....	\$252 00
2,956 miles travel.....	295 60
	577 60
C. E. Eldridge, M. C., 38 days board.....	\$228 00
2,784 miles travel.....	278 40
	506 40
J. C. Churchill, M. C., 67 days board.....	\$462 00
2,264 miles travel.....	226 40
	628 40
F. E. Woodbridge, M. C., 36 days board.....	\$216 00
1,100 miles travel.....	110 00
	326 00
G. S. Bontwell, M. C., 41 days board.....	\$246 00
908 miles travel.....	90 80
	336 80
Thos. Williams, M. C., 63 days board.....	\$378 00
760 miles travel.....	76 00
	454 00

Francis Thomas, M.C., 30 days board.....	\$180 00	
954 miles travel .....	94 40	
		\$274 40
Wm. Lawrence, M.C., 41 days board.....	\$246 00	
1,194 miles travel .....	119 40	
		365 40
Cash to G. S. Boutwell,	} To procure evidence,	550 00
Cash to J. F. Wilson,		610 00
Cash to Wm. Lawrence,		300 00
Cash to other parties,		2,350 00
Witnesses.....		6,500 00
Sergeant-at-Arms and deputies.....		7,149 10
		\$21,876 10

*Committee on Public Expenditures.*

C. T. Hulburt, M. C., 66 days board at \$6 per day.....	\$396 00
4,800 miles travel, at 10c.....	480 00
	\$876 00
E. H. Rollins, M. C., 43 days board, at \$6.....	\$258 00
1,392 miles travel.....	139 20
	397 20
J. M. Broomall, M. C., 11 days board, at \$6.....	\$66 00
596 miles travel.....	69 60
	135 60
Stenographers, 62 days board, at \$6.....	\$368 00
3,796 miles travel.....	379 60
	746 60
C. D. Hubbard, M. C., 8 days board, at \$6.....	\$48 00
400 miles travel.....	40 00
	88 00
Sergeant-at-Arms and assistants, board, mileage, expenses, etc.....	3,072 40
Carson and others, for procuring evidence..	800 00
Reporter.....	178 00
Estimate—witness fees and incidental ex- penses not included in the above.....	1,000 00
	\$7,294 80

*Committee on Internal Revenue Frauds.*

L. S. Tremble, M. C., 24 days board, at \$6.....	\$144 00
1,223 miles travel.....	122 00
	\$266 00
W. A. Darling, M. C., 24 days board, at \$6.....	\$144 00
1,223 miles travel.....	122 00
	266 00
F. C. Beman, M. C., 24 days board, at \$6.....	\$144 00
1,223 miles travel.....	122 00
	266 00
Leonard Myers, M. C., 24 days board, at \$6.....	\$144 00
1,223 miles travel.....	122 00
	266 00
B. F. Eggleston, M. C., 24 days board, at \$6.....	\$144 00
1,223 miles travel.....	122 00
	266 00
Witnesses, clerk and messenger.....	1,200 00
Sergeant-at-Arms, etc.....	1,151 93
	\$3,681 93

*Committee on Elections.*

Samuel Shellabarger, M. C., 15 days board.....	\$90 00
944 miles travel.....	94 40
	\$184 40
G. W. Schofield, M. C., 23 days board.....	\$138 00
1,173 miles travel.....	117 30
	256 30
B. C. Cook, M. C., 18 days board.....	\$108 00
1,173 miles travel.....	117 30
	225 30
L. G. Poland, M. C., 12 days board..	\$72 00
1,200 miles travel.....	120 00
	192 00
H. L. Dawes, M. C., 8 days board....	\$48 00
323 miles travel.....	32 00
	80 00



Sergeant-at-Arms .....	1,233 23
Witnesses—estimated.....	800 00
Clerk .....	2,160 00
Messenger .....	345 70
Stenographers' .....	539 50
	<hr/>
	\$6,009 93

*Committee on New Orleans Riots.*

T. D. Elliott, M. C., 21 days' board, at \$8.....	\$168 00
3,159 miles' travel.....	315 90
	<hr/>
	\$483 90
B. M. Boyer, M. C., 21 days' board, at \$8.....	\$168 00
3,159 miles' travel.....	315 90
	<hr/>
	483 90
Samuel Shellabarger, M. C., 16 days' board, at \$8.....	\$128 00
3,159 miles' travel.....	315 90
	<hr/>
	443 90
Sergeant-at-Arms and assistants.....	4,379 00
Witnesses, clerk, etc.....	4,161 00
Stenographers .....	1,191 60
	<hr/>
	\$11,142 30

*Committee on Pay Department.*

W. S. Lincoln, M. C., paid for use of parlor for meeting of committee and for services.....	\$189 15
49 days' board.....	249 00
3,736 miles' travel.....	373 60
	<hr/>
	\$856 75
A. Cobb, M. C., 26 days' board.....	\$128 00
2,440 miles' travel.....	244 00
	<hr/>
	372 00
G. W. Schofield, M. C., 20 days' board.....	\$120 00
1,110 miles' travel.....	111 00
	<hr/>
	231 00
W. S. Holman, M. C., 7 days' board.....	\$42 00
1,538 miles' travel.....	153 80
	<hr/>
	195 80
Clerk hire, witnesses, and other expenses..	4,500 00
Sergeant-at-Arms and assistants.....	1,833 85
	<hr/>
	\$7,989 40

*Committee on Southern Railroads.*

P. Sawyer, M. C., 20 days' board, at \$6.....	\$120 00
3,034 miles' travel.....	303 40
	<hr/>
	\$423 40
Clerk .....	750 00
Witnesses and other expenses.....	1,700 00
Sergeant-at-Arms.....	1,763 00
	<hr/>
	\$4,636 40

The foregoing statement shows an extravagant use of public money, that is certainly unequalled in the annals of public expenditures, and especially so when we reflect that almost the entire sum thus expended was for political purposes only. It will be remembered that none of these committees, except that on the Judiciary and Elections, have as yet made a report of their doings; they are, therefore, still continued for the purpose of giving to a set of hungry officers whose especial vocation is to feed upon the industry of the people, continued employment in perambulating over the country at ten cents per mile and six to eight dollars per day for board, in addition to their already enormously high salaries.

*Statement showing the amount of money expended by the committees named, as per House Mis. Doc. No. 31, 2d Sess. 40th Congress.*

Committee on Judiciary.....	\$21,876 00
Do Elections .....	6,600 00
Do Prisoners of War.....	6,214 00
Do New Orleans Riot.....	11,250 00
Do Pay Department.....	7,983 00
Do Public Expenditures.....	7,300 00
Do Revenue Frauds.....	3,700 00
Do Southern Railroads.....	4,636 00
	<hr/>
	\$69,465 00

This does not show the whole expenses, as large items have been held back for the next report that should have been included in the above. The report of 1869, will prove the truth of my statement.

The item for board included in the above account is as follows, to wit:

Members of Congress, 1,172 days.....	\$7,171 30
N. G. Ordway and deputies, 268 days .....	\$1,851 00
Estimated additional, not specifically charged.....	250 00
	<hr/>
	2,101 00
F. H. Smith, stenographer, 136 days.....	869 00
H. G. Hayes, 63 ".....	378 00
Ben. Pitman, 12 ".....	96 00
D. L. Eaton, clerk, 21 ".....	168 00
L. Harvey, messenger, 29 ".....	174 00
	<hr/>
	1,701
Estimated, to which add board and expenses included in other items.....	1,000 00
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$11,957 00

All the persons in the above table, except Harvey and Pitman, are receiving large salaries from the Government, and in addition to the board-bills, each of them were paid mileage, as follows:

Members of Congress.....	63,248 miles..	\$6,324 83
F. H. Smith.....	9,528 " ..	952 80
B. F. Hayes.....	3,600 " ..	360 00
Ben. Pitman.....	1,788 " ..	178 83
D. L. Eaton.....	3,153 " ..	315 90
L. Harvey.....	278 " ..	27 83
N. G. Ordway and deputies.....	190,000 " ..	19,000 00
	<hr/>	
	271,601	\$27,169 10

*The salaries are as follows:*

Members of Congress.....	\$5,000 00
F. H. Smith.....	4,380 00
B. F. Hayes.....	4,380 00
D. L. Eaton.....	2,160 00
N. G. Ordway.....	2,592 00

I have given more space to the examination of some of the many sources of extravagance than was intended in the outset, but there are so many fruitful items that deserve to be brought to the attention of the tax-payers, that I find it exceedingly difficult to confine the subject to a reasonable space. I shall endeavor, however, to condense as much as possible, keeping in view my original purpose of bringing to the attention of the people the infamous swindles that are being continually perpetrated upon their industry by the swarms of dishonest scoundrels that infest the country, and hold the offices.

I have presented facts enough already to condemn any party, or set of men, that authorize or tolerate the scoundrelism that is going on every day under the very nose of Congress. There are other facts connected with this infamous ring at the Capitol that are even more dark and damning than anything yet brought to light. I shall, therefore, give them such a notice as will, I trust, result in relieving the people, to some extent, from a continuation of some of the more barefaced and inexcusable of these outrages that have and are being committed daily.

I refer to the various departments of the House, which are sources of as wanton extravagance, in my judgment, as it is possible to find anywhere in this or any country.

I hope the reader will bear in mind all the facts in the forepart of this book, in regard to stationery, horse and carriage-hire, &c. What right have these men to get thousands of dollars from the pockets of the people, who are toiling night and day, and depriving themselves and families in many instances, of the most common necessities of life, in order to meet the demands of the tax-gatherer to supply the wants of the Government. What right has the Committee on Accounts to take thousands of dollars from the people's pockets to pay the expense of horses and carriages for the officers of the House, at an expense that is perfectly fabulous, while, at the same time, they receive enormous salaries from the Government? This is an outrage upon common decency, as well as on the people who furnish the money. It is a disgrace and scandal to the House of Representatives that they should, for a single day, tolerate such an infamous swindle.

Upon the adjournment of Congress, Mr. McPherson returns to his home in Pennsylvania, and remains there most of the time during vacations. Congress does not remain in session more than six months in the year. The Clerk is, therefore, away from the Capitol at least half the year; he takes his horses and carriage home with him, and receives his pay for them from the Government during the time he is rusticated at the expense of Uncle Sam.

Is this honest, is it fair toward the taxpayers of the country? He does not stop there; but he takes one of the Government employes who is receiving \$74 dollars per month, with him as a servant, to take care of the horses and drive his carriage. He appoints one James S. Crawford to a lucrative position, upon his pay-rolls—I mean pay-roll, for the pay is all there is in it, as Mr. Crawford has never been in the city of Washington—not even, as I have been informed, on a visit to his friend and relative, the honorable Clerk of the House of Representatives. The Clerk's report discloses the fact of Mr. Crawford being upon the pay-rolls of his office, and the fact that he (Crawford) never performed any ser-

vices for the Government, and the further fact that he never was in Washington, was communicated to me by an individual who is now living a neighbor to Mr. Crawford in the town of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and whose statement I believe to be true in every particular. The first place that Crawford's name appears, as far as I have been able to see, was on the engineer's pay-rolls; the next is the Temporary Clerk's rolls, this last roll giving him \$2,160 per year; quite a handsome *pension* for an old gentleman who was not wounded in the service of his country.

One other item in this connection deserves some notice, as it involves the expenditure of several thousand dollars. The following is the item:

Anna E. Ward, watcher and keeping fires in furnaces under folding room..... \$110 19

This item may be found each month for the last three or four years in the Clerk's report upon the contingent expenses of the House.

This lady is paid \$3.60 per day, amounting for the year to \$1,314, less government tax.

The facts in the case are, that another party performs this service, for which he receives \$720 per annum. If any one will take the trouble to examine the appropriation bills, they can find the payment for that identical service provided for specifically, and in the same language used in the Clerk's report, in this charge to Mrs. Ward.

These swindling transactions are augmented the more minutely as an investigation is prosecuted. In fact, they are so voluminous as to encompass an encyclopedia of corruptions unparalleled in the history of any people on earth. We think we have pointed out a sufficiency of *facts* to induce a more elaborate and thorough sweeping of the "*Augean Stable*" by those who are the guardians of the public weal, and who may have the power to send for persons and papers.

#### DOORKEEPER'S DEPARTMENT.

Insignificant and humble as this name would indicate, it is nevertheless one of the most powerful of all the departments connected with the House of Representatives. Its power is wielded with great effect upon legislation of the country, and especially is it most potent in matters connected with the contingent expenses of the House. This, in part, arises from the fact that almost every member of Congress has his man upon the Doorkeeper's rolls, or at least each State has quite a number. Those men, as a rule, receive their appointments through the influence of members of Congress. They are generally selected for the place on account of their services in political matters at home. This being the case, it is readily seen that those men who aided greatly in the election of members to Congress, have quite an influence over their action, especially when the interest of the Doorkeeper's department is at stake. I think I may safely say that



there was, during the year 1868, not less than one hundred and fifty men belonging to that department. The folding-room and congressional committee, &c., &c., are a part of this department. The folding-room however, is the scape-goat for all kinds of abuses and swindles, not only against individuals who belong to it, but against the Government, as I shall be able to show before I get through the inquiry I propose to make.

This folding-room roll furnishes clerks to committees that the House refuses to allow; the Republican Congressional Committee is also supplied from this department with its force, to a great extent; clerks to individual members of Congress are also drawn from this army of employes; and the Lord only knows, for I don't believe anybody else does, where all this vast number of men is employed; for sure it is, that not half of them, at any one time, are on duty about the Capitol.

A minute inquiry into the stupendous abuses and swindling that is carried on in this department would fill a volume of no small dimensions. I shall, therefore, be compelled to stop far short of doing full justice to this branch of my inquiry. The salaries and pay of employes in this department can not be less than \$150,000 per annum, (I incline to believe the amount much larger.) I presume that the public will never know the vast amount of money expended through this department for the year ending June 30, 1868, as that, with many other enormous expenditures, if given in detail, would create such a storm of furious indignation among the masses of the people, that the authors and perpetrators of such outrages would be compelled, for personal safety, to fly to the *mountains and desert places* for refuge from the *merited vengeance of the honest, toiling millions* of the country, on account of their base betrayal of the sacred trust confided to them.

It is no uncommon thing for men to be kept on the pay rolls of this department who are never required to perform any service whatever. Thousands of dollars are filched from the Treasury annually in this way, and there are large numbers of others who do not, upon an average, devote one-half of their time (even during sessions of Congress) to the performance of any service for the Government. In fact, the number is so great, that not one-half of them can be furnished with anything to do, or even a place except upon the pay-rolls.

The expenses of this department can be reduced at least one-half without any detriment to the public service; but instead of a reduction, the tendency is to increase the already fabulous expenses of the department.

There is another source of swindling connected with it that I can not pass unnoticed, for it is even more vicious and scandalous

than the employment of a force twice as large as the demands of the service require, and the keeping of men upon the rolls without requiring their presence at all.

It has been a custom for some years past for the House to pass a resolution at the end of the session authorizing the Doorkeeper to retain the employes during the vacation. Upon the adjournments, the Doorkeeper, through the superintendent of the folding-room, informs the men in his department that they can return to their homes, and remain there until the next meeting of Congress, upon condition that they pay an amount sufficient to hire substitutes, or persons not on the rolls, to do the work in the folding-room that would be required of them during the recess. This proposition looked so reasonable, that a large number of those living remote from Washington availed themselves of the privilege of returning to their homes upon the conditions mentioned.

During the recess of last summer (1867) the pay of those who were at home was sent to them, less the amount claimed to pay the substitutes. The money thus withheld for the purpose of paying substitutes, as claimed, amounted to several thousand dollars in the aggregate.

Upon making inquiry in regard to this matter, it was ascertained that no substitutes had been employed in the folding-room during the vacations, except, perhaps, one during the first recess, which was only three months. The swindle was so outrageous and apparent, that a submission to it would have been a cowardly surrender to the most villainous schemes that dishonesty could have invented. The money was paid to, or rather retained by Mr. Spicer, the superintendent of the folding-room, a subordinate of the Doorkeeper, Mr. Charles E. Lippincott. Upon learning the fact in regard to the swindle, Mr. Lippincott was requested to take such steps as would cause the money, thus wrongfully withheld from the men, to be at once refunded. His attention was called to the matter by a letter addressed to him on the first of June, detailing all the facts in relation to the matter, and also one of the parties, who had paid \$150 into the substitute fund, explained to him with great exactness the particulars in regard to the whole affair. The letter addressed to the Doorkeeper is too lengthy to insert here.

The following is the reply:

"JUNE 4, 1868.

"Will give this my attention, but I know already that there is a great exaggeration in your estimate. One thing I may say: Nobody need pay for a substitute, and if one chooses to go home at a certain price, it is hardly worth while to talk of frauds as between him and the superintendent of the folding-room. As I said before, the matter shall have my attention as soon as possible.

"C. E. LIPPINCOTT."

This answer needs but little comment. It is a simple begging of the question. It was supposed by those who paid their money

that they were dealing with honest men, and the amount to be paid for substitutes was what the hiring of them would cost; and if an equal assessment had been made upon all who were upon the rolls, and who did not work during the recess, one or two per cent. a month would have paid the whole substitute expense, for it could not have exceeded \$400. The facts are, that every one who worked in the folding-room, excepting one, from April 1 to July 1, received their pay from the Government, as the pay-roll, published in the Clerk's report, will show; also, the Blue Book for 1867 shows the same facts.

This matter was allowed to rest for several days, with a hope that the Doorkeeper would see that justice was done in the premises. Delay seemed to be the game that was being played, in order to avoid a refunding of the money. It, therefore, became apparent, that nothing would be done in the matter through that officer. The attention of several members of Congress was called to the subject, but without any different result. It now became certain that vigorous steps should be taken in the matter, as this session would soon terminate, which would leave them in full possession of their ill-gotten gain, as there would be no power after the adjournment to compel them to disgorge.

On the 22d of June, a letter was addressed to Hon. Speaker Colfax, as the organ of the House, explaining very minutely all the facts in the case, with a request to cause the money thus wrongfully withheld to be refunded at once, or bring the matter to the attention of the House, for the purpose of making the proper inquiry in regard to it; and if the charges, upon an investigation, were found to be true, to have the guilty parties exposed and punished. The writer of the letter, however, was informed by an honorable member of Congress that his honor the Speaker would have nothing to do with the subject.

That left but one other remedy, that of presenting the whole case to the public. Not that the public are interested in the subject as between the parties in the controversy, but they are interested to know whether or not men holding high positions will be permitted to perpetrate such high-handed villainies, and the injured parties to appeal in vain to the only tribunal that possessed the power to redress the wrong.

This refusal of the honorable Speaker to bring the matter to the attention of the House, is but another evidence of the fact that the people all over this country, without regard to former party affiliations, are beginning to realize the utter corruption and demoralization of the Republican party as such. I do not make this charge against individual members of Congress or of the party, for I have good reason to know that the Republican members of Congress, and the members of the party generally, as indi-

viduals, possess as much purity of character, and as high a degree of personal honor and integrity as others; but as a party organization, it does not possess one particle of honesty, integrity, or common decency. It has become the mere tender to the infamous, swindling, stock-jobbing rings that feed upon the honest industry of the country, from the Capitol in Washington, to the most remote corners of the globe. It is not strange, therefore, that a deaf ear should be turned to a request, in the most respectful terms, to look into a matter where one of the principal officers of the House of Representatives was charged with swindling to the amount of thousands, by obtaining money under false pretences.

The reason for this refusal is apparent: for if the rotten carcass was but stirred, the stench of its vile corruptions would cause the honest masses of the people to turn with loathing and disgust from the putrid form, that has robbed the industrial classes of the country of the fruits of their labor, for the purpose of lavishing it upon the high-salaried official, in paying for horse and carriage-hire, board bills, mileage, &c.

I have already mentioned the fact of persons being kept upon the Doorkeeper's pay-rolls without being required to perform any service. As an instance, I call attention to the name of H. Taylor. It is notorious to almost every person connected with the department, that Mr. Taylor has never been required to perform any service in the folding-room, or in any other place connected with the department, yet he is receiving \$120 per month. (See Clerk's report.) I am also informed that there are some facts connected with his appointment that would not reflect much credit upon those connected with it if they were made public. I forbear to give particulars. It is for the House to inquire.

The next case is where an individual commenced service, as I am informed, about the 20th of the month; when he applied for his pay, however, to his astonishment it was made out for the whole month. When he received his money, he was confronted by the superintendent of the folding-room with a demand for ninety odd dollars, stating at the time that he, the superintendent, had a man on from the 1st of the month until the 20th, and that the money was to pay him. *Query:* Why was not the name of the man, who, it was said, served in this case twenty days, placed upon the pay-rolls, so that he himself could sign the rolls and receive his money, he having served two-thirds of the month, instead of the one who had served but ten days being required to sign the rolls for the whole month, and receiving only about \$20 of the money? Who can answer the query?

Having gone through with this very imperfect examination of the more important items of expenditure of the House of Repre-



sentatives, I will simply add, that the extravagance of the United States Senate is fully equal to that of the House, but as that honorable body has not required the officer charged with the disbursement of the contingent fund to make a report for the last year, we are left in the dark, except as to the aggregate expenditure.

#### CONCLUSION.

It is scarcely worth while to ask who is responsible for the wanton extravagance and waste of the people's money as exhibited in the foregoing pages. In the waste that is shown in regard to the distribution of stationery and other articles furnished for the use of the House, the distributing officers have a greater individual responsibility than any one else, as all such matters are entrusted to them. In regard to keeping the names of persons upon the pay-rolls whose services are not required, also the enormous cost of horse and carriage-hire, &c., the head of each department has an individual responsibility in proportion to the scandalous waste that has been perpetrated under their supervision. The Committee on Accounts, however, whose duty it is to scan closely every item of the expenditure from the contingent fund, have shown in my judgment, the most shameful stupidity and ignorance, or the most criminal disregard of the high trust confided to them in matters connected with the expenditure of public money. Instead of standing at the door of the Treasury, with a two-edged sword, to guard well the entrance to the people's money, as was their duty, it would seem that they had abandoned their post, and allowed each one who chose to make his grab without let or hindrance. But the responsibility mentioned is subordinate to the great controlling power of the radical Congress that appropriates the money; for not one cent can be used for any purpose whatever, except it is first authorized by an

act of Congress. The appointment of an unheard of number of special committees, with unparalleled expenditures attending them, and that too for political aggrandizement, is a responsibility that this radical Congress can not shift, or avoid. The Democratic members who were appointed upon those committees, did but their duty in agreeing to serve, as those committees were appointed without their consent, and in most instances against their most solemn protest. The whole responsibility, therefore, rests upon the radical party.

If I have failed to convince the reader of the truth of the proposition that I announced in the beginning—the most scandalous, villainous, and dishonest squandering of public money—the fault is my own, and not the facts as they really exist. I have endeavored, however, in the examination of the subject, to present them in the most plain and forcible light that a due regard to truth and fair dealing, as between the *swindlers and the people*, would permit.

I have omitted the mention of many facts of great interest to the public, in regard to the abuses that are of daily occurrence in the management of the House expenditures. I trust, however, that an indulgent public will treat with forbearance the defects and imperfections found in the foregoing pages, as my only purpose in presenting them is the public good.

It is alleged that the stationery account for 1863 is over-stated; if that be true, the same may be said with regard to 1864, for the same exhibits, A, B, and C, were used in both cases. The rate of increase is the same in either case. Exhibit C is stationery used in Clerk's office.

Stationery for Clerk's office, 1863.....	\$3,000
“ “ 1864.....	1,000
Excess of 1863 over 1864 .....	\$2,000

The same per cent. of increase is shown in the whole stationery account.



3 0112 042493103